

## **II. REMARKS**

### **A. Status of the Claims**

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-9, 11-14, 16, 17, 19 and 20 are pending.

Claims 2, 5, 6, 10, 15, 18 and 21-28 have been previously cancelled.

### **B. Examiner Interview**

Applicant would like to take this opportunity to thank Examiner Oyebisi for the courtesies extended during the telephone interview conducted on September 15, 2009 (hereinafter referred to as the “Examiner Interview”).

During the Examiner Interview, the Examiner and Applicant’s Representative discussed U.S. Patent No. 6,347,307 (hereinafter “Sandhu”) in reference to claim 1. More specifically, Applicant’s Representative and the Examiner discussed the feature of claim 1 that provides for selecting an object “wherein at least one of the objects is a Watcher entity configured to monitor the modeled financial product, the Watcher entity being triggered in response to a change in the modeled financial product.” The Examiner agreed with Applicant’s Representative that Sandhu fails to teach the aforementioned feature of the presently pending claims. As a result, the Examiner stated that further consideration of the present application is required given the deficiencies of Sandhu. The Examiner memorialized these statements in the Examiner Interview Summary dated October 13, 2009.

### **C. Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-9, 11-14, 16, 17, 19 and 20 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,347,307 (hereinafter “Sandhu”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,757,710 (hereinafter “Reed”).

As described above, the Examiner stated that Sandhu fails to teach the feature of claim 1 that provides for selecting an object “wherein at least one of the objects is a Watcher entity configured to monitor the modeled financial product, the Watcher entity being triggered in response to a change in the modeled financial product.” Furthermore, Reed is relied on solely for allegedly disclosing a means for selecting an object from a palette and dragging the same from the palette to a window and therefore fails to cure the deficiency of Sandhu. Accordingly, the combined teachings of Sandu and Reed fail to make obvious all of the features of claim 1 and all claims dependant thereon.

In view of the foregoing remarks, claims 1, 3, 4, 7-9, 11-14, 16, 17, 19 and 20 are believed to be patentable over the combined teachings of Sandhu and Reed. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**III. CONCLUSION**

For at least the reasons set forth above, this patent application, as amended, is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of this patent application are respectfully requested.

If it will advance the prosecution of this patent application, the Examiner is urged to telephone (973.422.6724) Applicant's undersigned representative. All written communications should continue to be sent to the address provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Lowenstein Sandler PC  
65 Livingston Avenue  
Roseland, NJ 07068

Date: November 6, 2009

/Brian W. Weber/  
By: Brian W. Weber, Esq.  
Attorney for the Applicant  
Reg. No. 58,628